



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The Priests of Asklepios: A New Method of Dating Athenian Archons. By WILLIAM SCOTT FERGUSON. University of California Publications, Classical Philology, Vol. I, No. 5, pp. 131-73. Berkeley: University Press, 1906. \$0.50.

Ferguson's brilliant discovery (*Cornell Studies* VII, 1898) that the fixed official order of the tribes was followed in the selection of certain annually elected officers at Athens—the prytany-secretary, the secretary of the board of treasurers of Athena, and the Delian priests of Serapis—is happily supplemented in this important monograph by the addition to this list of the priests of Asclepius. Ferguson's first discovery was at once recognized as of the highest importance for the establishment of the chronology of the third and following centuries. Any archon whose name was linked with that of one of these tribal representatives, if the latter's deme were known, was forthwith known to have occupied a certain position as in a twelve- or thirteen-year group. The position of this group in relation to other groups could then often be determined through its historical evidence, by means of prosopographical data and of calculations based upon recorded intervals of time, and by the use of certain fixed points determined already by synchronisms with Roman consuls, Olympiads, etc.

The first tables of archons drawn up by Ferguson himself (*loc. cit.*, and especially *Corn. Stud.* X, 1899) by a rigid application of his secretary-canon have stood the test of searching criticism remarkably well. Though modified here and there by new documents and by new interpretations of the historical evidence, they are essentially the tables adopted by Kirchner in the *Prosopographia Attica* (1903). But serious doubts have been expressed—and quite naturally, considering the uncertain nature of the historical evidence at certain points—as to the applicability of the secretary-cycle to the entire period over which Ferguson extended it. Ferguson himself had shown that between 322/1 and 304/3, a period of political unrest, the tribal order was not followed, and Kirchner had discovered another break about the time of the Cremonidean war. Why should not similar interruptions have occurred at other crises? The fact that at a few fixed dates the tribe of the secretary did actually correspond to the requirements of the scheme might be due to coincidence; these fixed points were not numerous enough to establish Ferguson's contention that from 307/6 to 95/5 the secretary-cycle was in continuous use. So urged a number of scholars, especially Beloch and Kolbe. Beloch *Beitr. z. alt. Gesch.* I (1902), pp. 401 ff., regarded the calendar-cycle of eighteen years, based upon a regular sequence of common and intercalary years, as fundamental to any construction of the archon lists. Kolbe *Ath. Mitt.* XXX (1905), pp. 73 ff., on the other hand, distrusted as leading criteria both Ferguson's secretary-cycle, and

Beloch's calendar-cycle, and maintained that the period of an archon must first be fixed approximately by the historical notices, the exact year then to be determined by the normal position of the secretary's tribe. The results reached by both these scholars for the third century were in many details at variance with those of Ferguson and Kirchner.

Ferguson's latest discovery is therefore most timely. It not only completely restores confidence in his secretary-canon for the periods where its applicability was most disputed, but enables him to establish the fact that there were breaks in the system and to date them. And for these breaks he is able to offer plausible explanations in the political conditions of the time and to show that a method was followed even in starting afresh upon the cycle of tribes. Without following the author in the details of his demonstration, we may present an outline of the periods which he establishes and the means of control which he has made available for all future constructions of the archon lists:

Year	Official Order of Tribes Followed by	
352/1 to 322/1	Secretaries to treasurers of Athena. Prytany-secretaries } Priests of Asclepius }	Chosen from the same tribe.
307/6 to 262/1	Priests of Asclepius } Prytany-secretaries (from 306/5) Priests of Asclepius }	
261/60 to 231/30	Prytany-secretaries } Priests of Asclepius }	Chosen from the same tribe. The secretary-cycle was broken in 261/60 to restore the agreement. Break between 205/4, probably in 202/1.
230/29 to 138/7	Prytany-secretaries	
137/6 to 104/3	Prytany-secretaries } Priests of Serapis }	Chosen from the same tribe.
103/2 to 88/7	Priests of Serapis	
87/6	Priests of Asclepius.	Official order of tribes was abandoned for the secretaries after 103/2.

The tables of archons which Ferguson is now able to construct must be regarded as the nearest approximation yet reached to the true chronology of these three centuries. So far as the means of control above outlined are available in the names and demes of these annual officers, the list seems to the present reviewer unassailable. Some important archons, however, are still without the support of either secretary or priests, e. g., Philippus, whom Ferguson keeps in 393/2. At present I am disposed to believe that Clark's argument, *Class. Phil.* I, pp. 324 ff., based on the chronology of Menander, suffices at least to keep the question open, if not to settle it in favor of 392/1. But Wilhelm's dating (*Urkunden dramatischer Aufführungen*, pp. 63 ff.) of *IG. II.* 975 f, if correct, would deprive Clark's argument of one external support.

It may seem ungracious to pick out small defects in a contribution of such value; but just because it is so fine a piece of work, and shows such mastery in its use of the epigraphical and historical materials, one

regrets to see in it marks of hasty composition. Certain phrases (p. 143, n. 21; p. 152, n. 40; 154, l. 2; 168, l. 22) are too German ever to become good English, while "ruled out" and "line up" involve figures which may become unacademic some day. On p. 139, l. 8, read "Olympiad 139, 4" for 142, 2, and on p. 159, n. 73, the reference should be to p. 140.

EDWARD CAPPS

Aischylos' Choephoren. Erklärende Ausgabe von FRIEDERICH BLASS. Halle: Niemeyer, 1906. Pp. 205. M. 5.

Professor Blass himself probably does not believe that it is possible to restore with certainty the hand of Aeschylus in the corrupt choruses of the *Choephoroe*. But there is something inspiring in the youthful zest and inexhaustible ingenuity of resource with which he throws himself into the task. As he himself says, ἀγαθὴ δ' ἔρις ἥδε βροτοῖσι. No scholar can work through this commentary without receiving many valuable lessons in critical method and many helpful suggestions for the interpretation of Aeschylus. The Introduction, following, though not slavishly, Robert's *Bild und Lied*, presents the development of the legend. Wilamowitz' "Delphic poem" is ignored because "there is no evidence that it existed;" and his theory that Aeschylus is hostile to Apollo is met by the explanation that the trial scene in the *Eumenides* is merely a mythological symbol of the conflict between old and new moral ideals.

In the commentary exegesis, though not neglected, is subordinated to the critical recension of the text. Space fails to enter into detail here. I may merely note the following readings:

317 καθ' ἐν οὐρίας—367 κτανόντεσσιν—382 ἄμπεμπ(ε)—389 φρενὶ θεῖον ἔμπας—417 πρὸς τὸ φάμῃσαι καλῶς—439 ἐθ' ὡς τόδ' εἰδῆις—467 κἀπαράμυθος ἄτας—492 ὡς ἐκαίνισαν—656 φιλόξεν' ἐστὶν Αἰγίσθον διαί is retained—760 γναφεὺς τροφεὺς τ' οὐ ταῦτ' ἐν εἰχέτην τέλος!—957 κρατεῖ πως τὸ θεῖον παρὰ τὸ μὴ ὑπουργεῖν κακοῖς deprives Aeschylus of an interesting idea.—994 τίς οὐ δοκεῖ weakens the rhetoric more than it helps the grammar.

In 156 Blass affirms that ἐξ ἀμαυρᾶς φρένος cannot be taken with κλύε, but must, as in *Ag.* 556, refer to the speaker. Yes, but in *Ag.* 556 it also goes with the verb, as, I think, here. The meaning is that of Pindar's ἀκούοντί που χθονίᾳ φρενί. The construction κλύειν ἐξ ἀμαυρᾶς φρενός etc. is no more impossible than Plato's ἐκ μὲν ἀδίκου καὶ κακοῦ ἑαντοῦ θεωρομένα, *Leges* 663 c. In 305 he accepts the emendation εἰ δ' ἐμῇ *Rh. Mus.* X, p. 462; but εἰ δὲ μὴ τάχ' εἴσεται is, as Wecklein's note shows, a natural idiomatic formula of defiance: "If he denies it, I'll teach him." There is no question of Orestes' θήλεια φρήν and to introduce that thought Greek idiom would employ καί in addition to δέ, to say nothing of the article.

PAUL SHOREY